

A NOTE ON JENSEN INEQUALITY FOR SELF-ADJOINT OPERATORS

TOMOHIRO HAYASHI

ABSTRACT. In this paper we consider the order-like relation for self-adjoint operators on some Hilbert space. This relation is defined by using Jensen inequality. We will show that under some assumptions this relation is anti-symmetric.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $f(t)$ be a continuous, increasing concave function on the real line $\mathbb{R}$ and let A be a bounded self-adjoint operator on some Hilbert space $\mathfrak{H}$ with an inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$. Then for each unit vector $\xi \in \mathfrak{H}$, we have so-called Jensen inequality:

$$\langle f(A)\xi, \xi \rangle \leq f(\langle A\xi, \xi \rangle).$$

For two self-adjoint operators X and Y , if they satisfy $f(X) \leq f(Y)$, then by using Jensen inequality we have

$$\langle f(X)\xi, \xi \rangle \leq \langle f(Y)\xi, \xi \rangle \leq f(\langle Y\xi, \xi \rangle).$$

Therefore if $\langle f(X)\xi, \xi \rangle \leq f(\langle Y\xi, \xi \rangle)$ for any unit vector $\xi \in \mathfrak{H}$, we may consider that X is dominated by Y in some sense. Keeping this in our minds, we shall consider the following problem: If we have $\langle f(X)\xi, \xi \rangle \leq f(\langle Y\xi, \xi \rangle)$ and $\langle f(Y)\xi, \xi \rangle \leq f(\langle X\xi, \xi \rangle)$ for any unit vector $\xi \in \mathfrak{H}$, can we conclude $X = Y$? (This problem was suggested by Professor Bourin [2].)

The main results of this paper consist of two theorems. In section 2 we will solve the above problem affirmatively when the Hilbert space $\mathfrak{H}$ is finite dimensional. Unfortunately we cannot show this in the infinite dimensional case. But in section 3 we will solve a modified problem in full generality.

Here we remark that in the paper [1], T. Ando considered similar problem and showed the following theorem: “Let $f(t)$ be an operator monotone function. If two positive invertible operators X and Y satisfy $\langle f(X)\xi, \xi \rangle \leq f(\langle Y\xi, \xi \rangle)$ and $f(\langle Y^{-1}\xi, \xi \rangle^{-1}) \leq \langle f(X)^{-1}\xi, \xi \rangle^{-1}$ for any unit vector $\xi \in \mathfrak{H}$, then we have $f(X) = f(Y)$.”

The author wishes to express his hearty gratitude to Professor Jean-Christophe Bourin. The author is also grateful to Professor Yoshihiro Nakamura for discussion. The author would like to thank Professor Tsuyoshi Ando for valuable comments.

Throughout this paper we assume that the readers are familiar with basic notations and results on operator theory. We refer the readers to Conway's book [3].

We denote by $\mathfrak{H}$ a (finite or infinite dimensional) complex Hilbert space and by $B(\mathfrak{H})$ all bounded linear operators on it. For each operator $A \in B(\mathfrak{H})$, its operator norm is denoted by $\|A\|$. For two vectors $\xi, \eta \in \mathfrak{H}$, their inner product and norm are denoted by $\langle \xi, \eta \rangle$ and $\|\xi\|$ respectively. For an interval $[a, b]$, we denote its defining function by $\chi_{[a,b]}(t)$.

2. FINITE DIMENSIONAL CASE

Theorem 2.1. *For two hermitian matrices $X, Y \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$ and a continuous strictly increasing (or decreasing) convex function $f(t)$ on some interval I containing the numerical ranges of X and Y , if they satisfy*

$$\langle f(X)\xi, \xi \rangle \geq f(\langle Y\xi, \xi \rangle)$$

and

$$\langle f(Y)\xi, \xi \rangle \geq f(\langle X\xi, \xi \rangle)$$

for any unit vector $\xi \in \mathbb{C}^n$, then we have $X = Y$.

Proof. Replacing $f(t)$ by $f(t) + c$ for some positive constant c if necessarily, we may assume that $f \geq 0$ on I . Then $f(X)$ and $f(Y)$ are positive semidefinite matrices. Take minimal projections P and Q such that $XP = PX$, $YQ = QY$, $f(X)P = \|f(X)\|P$ and $f(Y)Q = \|f(Y)\|Q$. Then for each unit vector $\xi \in Q\mathbb{C}^n$ we see that $\langle f(X)\xi, \xi \rangle Q = Qf(X)Q$ and $f(\langle Y\xi, \xi \rangle)Q = \|f(Y)\|Q$. Therefore by assumption we have $Qf(X)Q \geq \|f(Y)\|Q$ and hence $\|f(X)\|Q \geq Qf(X)Q \geq \|f(Y)\|Q$. By the similar way we see that $\|f(Y)\|P \geq Pf(Y)P \geq \|f(X)\|P$. Hence we get $\|f(X)\| = \|f(Y)\|$ and $Qf(X)Q = \|f(X)\|Q$. Since

$$0 = Q(\|f(X)\| - f(X))Q = Q(\|f(X)\| - f(X))^{\frac{1}{2}}(\|f(X)\| - f(X))^{\frac{1}{2}}Q,$$

we have

$$Qf(X) = f(X)Q = \|f(X)\|Q = \|f(Y)\|Q = f(Y)Q$$

and hence $QX = XQ = YQ$. (Here we use the existence of $f^{-1}(t)$.) Since two matrices $X(1 - Q)$ and $Y(1 - Q)$ satisfy same assumptions on $(1 - Q)\mathbb{C}^n$, we can repeat this argument. Therefore we get $X = Y$.

□

Corollary 2.2. *For two hermitian matrices $X, Y \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$ and a continuous strictly increasing (or decreasing) concave function $f(t)$ on some interval I containing the numerical ranges of X and Y , if they satisfy*

$$\langle f(X)\xi, \xi \rangle \leq f(\langle Y\xi, \xi \rangle)$$

and

$$\langle f(Y)\xi, \xi \rangle \leq f(\langle X\xi, \xi \rangle)$$

for any unit vector $\xi \in \mathbb{C}^n$, then we have $X = Y$.

Proof. Apply the previous theorem to the function $-f(t)$.

□

Remark 2.1. If $f(X)$ and $f(Y)$ are of the forms

$$f(X) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda_i P_i \quad f(Y) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \mu_j Q_j$$

where $\{P_i\}_i$ and $\{Q_j\}_j$ are orthogonal family of projections and $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots$ and $\mu_1 \geq \mu_2 \geq \dots$, then Theorem 2.1 holds by the same proof. For example, if both X and Y are compact positive and $f(t)$ is strictly increasing, then $f(X)$ and $f(Y)$ are of the above forms.

3. INFINITE DIMENSIONAL CASE

Let $f(t)$ and $g(t)$ be positive, strictly increasing, concave C^2 -functions on $(0, \infty)$ and continuous on $[0, \infty)$. For a positive operator A , by Jensen inequality we have

$$\langle (g \circ f)(A)\xi, \xi \rangle \leq g(\langle f(A)\xi, \xi \rangle) \leq (g \circ f)(\langle A\xi, \xi \rangle)$$

for any unit vector $\xi \in \mathfrak{H}$. We would like to consider the “converse” of this fact.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $f(t)$ and $g(t)$ be positive, strictly increasing, concave C^2 -functions on $(0, \infty)$ and continuous on $[0, \infty)$. For two positive operators $X, Y \in B(\mathfrak{H})$, if they satisfy*

$$\langle (g \circ f)(X)\xi, \xi \rangle \leq g(\langle f(Y)\xi, \xi \rangle) \leq (g \circ f)(\langle X\xi, \xi \rangle)$$

for any unit vector $\xi \in \mathfrak{H}$, then we have $X = Y$.

For example consider the case $f(t) = g(t) = \sqrt{t}$. Then we have;

Example 3.1. For two positive operators $X, Y \in B(\mathfrak{H})$, if they satisfy

$$\langle X^{\frac{1}{4}}\xi, \xi \rangle \leq \langle Y^{\frac{1}{2}}\xi, \xi \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \langle X\xi, \xi \rangle^{\frac{1}{4}}$$

for any unit vector $\xi \in \mathfrak{H}$, then we have $X = Y$

The strategy of the proof is essentially same as that of [1][4].

Lemma 3.2 (Ando [1]). *Let $h(t)$ be a positive, strictly increasing, concave C^2 -function on $(0, \infty)$ and continuous on $[0, \infty)$. For positive operators A and B , the inequality*

$$\langle h(A)\xi, \xi \rangle \leq h(\langle B\xi, \xi \rangle)$$

holds for any unit vector $\xi \in \mathfrak{H}$ if and only if we have

$$h(A) \leq h'(\lambda)B - \lambda h'(\lambda) + h(\lambda)$$

for any positive number λ .

Proof. First we will show the “only if” part. Since $h(t)$ is concave, we have

$$h(t) \leq h'(\lambda)t - \lambda h'(\lambda) + h(\lambda).$$

(The right-hand side is the tangent line of $h(t)$ at $t = \lambda$.) Letting $t = \langle B\xi, \xi \rangle$, we get

$$h(\langle B\xi, \xi \rangle) \leq h'(\lambda)\langle B\xi, \xi \rangle - \lambda h'(\lambda) + h(\lambda) = \langle \{h'(\lambda)B - \lambda h'(\lambda) + h(\lambda)\}\xi, \xi \rangle.$$

Combining this with the inequality $\langle h(A)\xi, \xi \rangle \leq h(\langle B\xi, \xi \rangle)$, we see that

$$h(A) \leq h'(\lambda)B - \lambda h'(\lambda) + h(\lambda).$$

Conversely if

$$h(A) \leq h'(\lambda)B - \lambda h'(\lambda) + h(\lambda)$$

holds for any $\lambda > 0$, we see that for any unit vector $\xi \in \mathfrak{H}$

$$\langle h(A)\xi, \xi \rangle \leq \langle (h'(\lambda)B - \lambda h'(\lambda) + h(\lambda))\xi, \xi \rangle = h'(\lambda)\langle B\xi, \xi \rangle - \lambda h'(\lambda) + h(\lambda).$$

Then it is easy to see that the minimal value of the right-hand side with respect to $\lambda > 0$ is equal to $h(\langle B\xi, \xi \rangle)$. $\square$

Lemma 3.3. *Under the assumptions in Theorem 3.1, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{(g \circ f)(X) + f(\lambda)g'(f(\lambda)) - g(f(\lambda))}{g'(f(\lambda))} &\leq f(Y) \\ &\leq f'(\lambda)X - \lambda f'(\lambda) + f(\lambda) \end{aligned}$$

for any positive number λ .

Proof. By assumptions we have two inequalities

$$\langle g(f(X))\xi, \xi \rangle \leq g(\langle f(Y)\xi, \xi \rangle)$$

and

$$\langle f(Y)\xi, \xi \rangle \leq f(\langle X\xi, \xi \rangle)$$

for any unit vector $\xi \in \mathfrak{H}$. So by the previous lemma we get

$$g(f(X)) \leq g'(\mu)f(Y) - \mu g'(\mu) + g(\mu)$$

and

$$f(Y) \leq f'(\lambda)X - \lambda f'(\lambda) + f(\lambda).$$

for any positive numbers μ and λ . Letting $\mu = f(\lambda)$ we get the desired inequality. $\square$

Lemma 3.4. *Fix two positive numbers $0 < a < b$. Then there exists a positive constant c (depending on the choice of a, b) such that*

$$f'(\lambda)t - \lambda f'(\lambda) + f(\lambda) - \left\{ \frac{(g \circ f)(t) + f(\lambda)g'(f(\lambda)) - g(f(\lambda))}{g'(f(\lambda))} \right\} \leq c(t - \lambda)^2$$

for any $a \leq \lambda \leq b$ and $a \leq t \leq b$.

Proof. Set

$$k(t) = k_\lambda(t) = c(t - \lambda)^2 - f'(\lambda)t + \lambda f'(\lambda) - f(\lambda) + \left\{ \frac{(g \circ f)(t) + f(\lambda)g'(f(\lambda)) - g(f(\lambda))}{g'(f(\lambda))} \right\}.$$

We will choose an appropriate constant c later. Fix λ and we consider $k(t)$ as a one variable function. Then we see that

$$k'(t) = 2c(t - \lambda) - f'(\lambda) + \frac{(g' \circ f)(t)f'(t)}{g'(f(\lambda))}$$

and

$$k''(t) = 2c + \frac{(g'' \circ f)(t)f'(t)^2 + (g' \circ f)(t)f''(t)}{g'(f(\lambda))}.$$

By assumptions we can take c such that $k''(t) > 0$ for any $a \leq \lambda \leq b$ and $a \leq t \leq b$. Then since $k'(\lambda) = 0$, we have $k'(t) \leq 0$ ($t \leq \lambda$) and $k'(t) \geq 0$ ($t \geq \lambda$). Hence we have $k(t) \geq k(\lambda) = 0$. $\square$

Take two positive numbers $0 < a < b$ such that $\|X\| < b$ and $\|Y\| < b$. We can find a positive number α (depending on the choice of a, b) such that

$$\frac{(g \circ f)(t) + f(\lambda)g'(f(\lambda)) - g(f(\lambda))}{g'(f(\lambda))} + \alpha \geq 1$$

for any $a \leq \lambda \leq b$ and $a \leq t \leq b$.

Lemma 3.5. *There exists a positive constant c such that*

$$\left\{ \frac{(g \circ f)(t) + f(\lambda)g'(f(\lambda)) - g(f(\lambda))}{g'(f(\lambda))} + \alpha \right\}^{-1} - \{f'(\lambda)t - \lambda f'(\lambda) + f(\lambda) + \alpha\}^{-1} \leq c(t - \lambda)^2$$

for any $a \leq \lambda \leq b$ and $a \leq t \leq b$. The constant c is same as that of the previous lemma.

Proof. Set

$$p(t) = f'(\lambda)t - \lambda f'(\lambda) + f(\lambda) + \alpha$$

and

$$q(t) = \frac{(g \circ f)(t) + f(\lambda)g'(f(\lambda)) - g(f(\lambda))}{g'(f(\lambda))} + \alpha.$$

Fix λ and we consider $p(t)$, $q(t)$ as one variable functions. Then $p(t) \geq q(t) \geq 1$ and by the previous lemma we have $p(t) - q(t) \leq c(t - \lambda)^2$. So we get

$$q(t)^{-1} - p(t)^{-1} = q(t)^{-1}p(t)^{-1}(p(t) - q(t)) \leq c(t - \lambda)^2.$$

□

Proof of Theorem 3.1. Take a spectral projection P of X . By lemma 3.3 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\{ \frac{(g \circ f)(X) + f(\lambda)g'(f(\lambda)) - g(f(\lambda))}{g'(f(\lambda))} + \alpha \right\} P &\leq P(f(Y) + \alpha)P \\ &\leq \{(f'(\lambda)X - \lambda f'(\lambda) + f(\lambda)) + \alpha\}P \end{aligned}$$

for any positive number λ . On the other hand we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\{ \frac{(g \circ f)(X) + f(\lambda)g'(f(\lambda)) - g(f(\lambda))}{g'(f(\lambda))} + \alpha \right\} P &\leq (f(X) + \alpha)P \\ &\leq \{(f'(\lambda)X - \lambda f'(\lambda) + f(\lambda)) + \alpha\}P \end{aligned}$$

for any positive number λ . Combining these with lemma 3.4 we get

$$\|(f(X) + \alpha)P - P(f(Y) + \alpha)P\| \leq c\|XP - \lambda P\|^2 \quad (1)$$

whenever $P \leq \chi_{[a,b]}(X)$ and $a \leq \lambda \leq b$.

Similarly since we have two inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} \{(f'(\lambda)X - \lambda f'(\lambda) + f(\lambda)) + \alpha\}^{-1}P &\leq P(f(Y) + \alpha)^{-1}P \\ &\leq \left\{ \frac{(g \circ f)(X) + f(\lambda)g'(f(\lambda)) - g(f(\lambda))}{g'(f(\lambda))} + \alpha \right\}^{-1}P \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \{(f'(\lambda)X - \lambda f'(\lambda) + f(\lambda)) + \alpha\}^{-1}P &\leq (f(X) + \alpha)^{-1}P \\ &\leq \left\{ \frac{(g \circ f)(X) + f(\lambda)g'(f(\lambda)) - g(f(\lambda))}{g'(f(\lambda))} + \alpha \right\}^{-1}P, \end{aligned}$$

by lemma 3.5 we get

$$\|(f(X) + \alpha)^{-1}P - P(f(Y) + \alpha)^{-1}P\| \leq c\|XP - \lambda P\|^2$$

whenever $P \leq \chi_{[a,b]}(X)$ and $a \leq \lambda \leq b$. Hence in this case

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|(f(X) + \alpha)P - (P(f(Y) + \alpha)^{-1}P)^{-1}\| \\
&= \|(f(X) + \alpha)\{P(f(Y) + \alpha)^{-1}P - (f(X) + \alpha)^{-1}P\}(P(f(Y) + \alpha)^{-1}P)^{-1}\| \\
&\leq \|f(X) + \alpha\| \cdot \|(P(f(Y) + \alpha)^{-1}P)^{-1}\| \cdot \|(P(f(Y) + \alpha)^{-1}P - (f(X) + \alpha)^{-1}P)\| \\
&\leq (f(b) + \alpha)^2 c \|XP - \lambda P\|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore for $P \leq \chi_{[a,b]}(X)$ and $a \leq \lambda \leq b$ we have

$$\|P(f(Y) + \alpha)P - (P(f(Y) + \alpha)^{-1}P)^{-1}\| \leq (1 + (f(b) + \alpha)^2)c\|XP - \lambda P\|^2. \quad (2)$$

The rest of the proof is almost same as that of [1][4]. We include this for the reader's convenience.

For each integer n , let P_i ($i = 1, 2, \dots, n$) be the spectral projections of X corresponding to the interval $[a + \frac{(i-1)(b-a)}{n}, a + \frac{i(b-a)}{n})$. Then we have $\sum_i P_i = \chi_{[a,b]}(X)$ and

$$\|XP_i - \lambda_i P_i\| \leq \frac{b-a}{n}$$

where $\lambda_i = a + \frac{(i-1)(b-a)}{n}$. Then it follows from (1) that

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \{(f(X) + \alpha)P_i - P_i(f(Y) + \alpha)P_i\} \right\| \leq \frac{c(b-a)^2}{n^2}. \quad (3)$$

Similarly it follows from (2) that

$$\|P_i(f(Y) + \alpha)P_i - (P_i(f(Y) + \alpha)^{-1}P_i)^{-1}\| \leq \frac{(1 + (f(b) + \alpha)^2)c(b-a)^2}{n^2}.$$

By using the following formula, which is so-called Schur complement

$$(P_i(f(Y) + \alpha)^{-1}P_i)^{-1} = P_i(f(Y) + \alpha)P_i - P_i(f(Y) + \alpha)P_i^\perp(P_i^\perp(f(Y) + \alpha)P_i^\perp)^{-1}P_i^\perp(f(Y) + \alpha)P_i$$

where $P_i^\perp = 1 - P_i$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|P_i^\perp(f(Y) + \alpha)P_i\|^2 &= \|(P_i^\perp(f(Y) + \alpha)P_i^\perp)^{1/2}(P_i^\perp(f(Y) + \alpha)P_i^\perp)^{-1/2}P_i^\perp(f(Y) + \alpha)P_i\|^2 \\
&\leq \|f(Y) + \alpha\| \cdot \|(P_i^\perp(f(Y) + \alpha)P_i^\perp)^{-1/2}P_i^\perp(f(Y) + \alpha)P_i\|^2 \\
&= \|f(Y) + \alpha\| \cdot \|P_i(f(Y) + \alpha)P_i^\perp(P_i^\perp(f(Y) + \alpha)P_i^\perp)^{-1}P_i^\perp(f(Y) + \alpha)P_i\| \\
&= \|f(Y) + \alpha\| \cdot \|P_i(f(Y) + \alpha)P_i - (P_i(f(Y) + \alpha)^{-1}P_i)^{-1}\| \\
&\leq \frac{(f(b) + \alpha)(1 + (f(b) + \alpha)^2)c(b-a)^2}{n^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore by the well-known formula $\|A\|^2 = \|AA^*\| = \|A^*A\|$ we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \sum_{i=1}^n P_i^\perp(f(Y) + \alpha)P_i \right\|^2 &= \left\| \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n P_i^\perp(f(Y) + \alpha)P_i \right\} \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^n P_j(f(Y) + \alpha)P_j^\perp \right\} \right\| \\
&= \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n P_i^\perp(f(Y) + \alpha)P_i(f(Y) + \alpha)P_i^\perp \right\| \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^n \|P_i^\perp(f(Y) + \alpha)P_i(f(Y) + \alpha)P_i^\perp\| \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n \|P_i^\perp(f(Y) + \alpha)P_i\|^2 \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{(f(b) + \alpha)(1 + (f(b) + \alpha)^2)c(b - a)^2}{n^2} \\
&= \frac{(f(b) + \alpha)(1 + (f(b) + \alpha)^2)c(b - a)^2}{n}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus we get

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^n P_i^\perp(f(Y) + \alpha)P_i \right\| \leq \sqrt{\frac{(f(b) + \alpha)(1 + (f(b) + \alpha)^2)c(b - a)^2}{n}}. \quad (4)$$

Since

$$f(Y)\chi_{[a,b)}(X) = \sum_{i=1}^n P_i(f(Y) + \alpha)P_i + \sum_{i=1}^n P_i^\perp(f(Y) + \alpha)P_i,$$

by using (3) and (4) we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|f(X)\chi_{[a,b)}(X) - f(Y)\chi_{[a,b)}(X)\| \\
&\leq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \{(f(X) + \alpha)P_i - P_i(f(Y) + \alpha)P_i\} \right\| + \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n P_i^\perp(f(Y) + \alpha)P_i \right\| \\
&\leq \frac{c(b - a)^2}{n^2} + \sqrt{\frac{(f(b) + \alpha)(1 + (f(b) + \alpha)^2)c(b - a)^2}{n}}.
\end{aligned}$$

By tending $n \rightarrow \infty$ we get $f(X)\chi_{[a,b)}(X) = f(Y)\chi_{[a,b)}(X)$. Since a is arbitrary we have $f(X)\chi_{(0,b)}(X) = f(Y)\chi_{(0,b)}(X)$. Therefore in order to show $f(X) = f(Y)$, now it is enough to show that $\chi_{\{0\}}(X) = \chi_{\{0\}}(Y)$.

For any unit vector $\xi \in \mathfrak{H}$ such that $X\xi = 0$, we see that

$$f(0) + \langle (f(Y) - f(0))\xi, \xi \rangle = \langle f(Y)\xi, \xi \rangle \leq f(\langle X\xi, \xi \rangle) = f(0).$$

Therefore $f(Y)\xi = f(0)\xi$ and hence $Y\xi = 0$. Conversely for any unit vector $\xi \in \mathfrak{H}$ such that $Y\xi = 0$, we see that

$$(g \circ f)(0) + \langle ((g \circ f)(X) - (g \circ f)(0))\xi, \xi \rangle = \langle (g \circ f)(X)\xi, \xi \rangle \leq g(\langle f(Y)\xi, \xi \rangle) = (g \circ f)(0).$$

Therefore $(g \circ f)(X)\xi = (g \circ f)(0)\xi$ and hence $X\xi = 0$. $\square$

Remark 3.1. (i) In lemma 3.4, the assumption $a > 0$ is crucial. For example if we consider the case $a = 0$ and $f(t) = g(t) = \sqrt{t}$, then lemma 3.4 is wrong. Indeed in this case

$$\begin{aligned} f'(\lambda)t - \lambda f'(\lambda) + f(\lambda) - \left\{ \frac{(g \circ f)(t) + f(\lambda)g'(f(\lambda)) - g(f(\lambda))}{g'(f(\lambda))} \right\} \\ = \frac{t}{2\sqrt{\lambda}} + \frac{3\sqrt{\lambda}}{2} - 2\lambda^{\frac{1}{4}}t^{\frac{1}{4}}. \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see that

$$\frac{1}{(t - \lambda)^2} \left\{ \frac{t}{2\sqrt{\lambda}} + \frac{3\sqrt{\lambda}}{2} - 2\lambda^{\frac{1}{4}}t^{\frac{1}{4}} \right\}$$

is unbounded for $0 < \lambda \leq b$ and $0 < t \leq b$. (Fix $t > 0$ and consider the case $\lambda \rightarrow +0$. Then this function tends to ∞ .)

- (ii) The argument in this section cannot be applied directly to the problem in the previous section. For simplicity, we would like consider the case $f(t) = \sqrt{t}$. Let X and Y be positive operators on $\mathfrak{H}$. Suppose that they satisfy

$$\langle \sqrt{X}\xi, \xi \rangle \leq \sqrt{\langle Y\xi, \xi \rangle}$$

and

$$\langle \sqrt{Y}\xi, \xi \rangle \leq \sqrt{\langle X\xi, \xi \rangle}$$

for any unit vector $\xi \in \mathfrak{H}$. Then by lemma 3.2 we have

$$\sqrt{X} \leq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\lambda}}Y + \frac{\sqrt{\lambda}}{2}$$

and

$$\sqrt{Y} \leq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\lambda}}X + \frac{\sqrt{\lambda}}{2}$$

for any $\lambda > 0$. By the first inequality we have

$$2\sqrt{\lambda X} - \lambda \leq Y.$$

Since the left-hand side in this inequality is not positive, we cannot take a square root. This is the main trouble. By this reason we cannot show the statement like lemma3.3.

REFERENCES

- [1] T. Ando, *Functional calculus with operator-monotone functions*, Math. Inequal. Appl. (to appear)
- [2] J-C. Bourin, private communication,
- [3] J. B. Conway, *A course in operator theory*. Graduate Studies in Mathematics, 21. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2000.
- [4] T. Hayashi, *Non-commutative A-G mean inequality*. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. (to appear)

(Tomohiro Hayashi) NAGOYA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, GOKISO-CHO, SHOWA-KU, NAGOYA,
AICHI, 466-8555, JAPAN

E-mail address, Tomohiro Hayashi: `hayashi.tomohiro@nitech.ac.jp`